



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
ASSISTANT SECRETARY AND COMMISSIONER OF
PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Paper No. 16

Serial Number: 08/335,981
Filing Date: 11/08/94
Appellant(s): Horace L. Freeman

MAILED

JAN - 3 1997

GROUP 3300

Woodock Washburn Kurtz Mackiewicz and Morris
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to appellant's brief on appeal filed
August 19, 1996.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the
brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after
final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Invention

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Issues

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is
correct.

(7) Grouping of Claims

11. Appellant's brief includes a statement that claims 1-33 ~~222~~ do not

stand or fall together and provides reasons as set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) and (c)(8).

(8) Claims Appealed

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(9) Prior Art of Record

4,898,159	Buese	2-1990
4,968,542	Gasper	11-1990
3,097,644	Parker	07-1963
878,38	Paxit	11-1987

(10) New Prior Art

No new prior art has been applied in this examiner's answer.

(11) Grounds of Rejection

Claims 1-5, 9, 12, 15, 19-20 and 23-24 remain finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Buese '159

Claims 6-8, 10-11, 13-14, 16-18, 21-22, 25-27 and 29-30 remain finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Buese' 159 in view of Gasper.

Claim 28 remains finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claim 25 above and in further view of Parker

Claims 31-33 remain finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Buese '159 in view of Paxit.

(12) New Ground of Rejection

This examiner's answer does not contain any new ground of rejection.

(13) Response to argument

Appellant argues that Buese does not suggest applying a dye to the fabric. However, Buese clearly recites that the dye is incorporate into the binder and that the binder can be coated on the fabric (column 5, lines 10-13). Appellant argues that Gasper does not disclose a coloring agent. However, it is old and well known in the art that an ace bandage includes a tan dye therein. The ace band also includes a blue dye that indicates that the bandage is an ace bandage. Thus, at least two dyes are incorporated into the Gasper's reference. Appellant argues that Parker does not remedy the deficiencies of Buese and Gasper. However, Parker was used as a modifier to provide a casting material made of cotton and synthetic fibers. Appellant argues that the teachings of using a printing step to deposit a dye onto a polyester fabric of a decorative wall panel is non analogous to the step of printing a deposit of dye onto the open-mesh fibrous tape of a cast. However, the teaching in Paxit makes it obvious to use the printing step to apply a pattern of a dye onto the cast material as disclosed by Buese. Freeman provides the teaching of transforming a printed pattern onto a fabric.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Serial No. 08/335,981
Art Unit 3301

-5-

Michael Brown:bhw
(703) 308-0858
January 2, 1997

Michael A. Brown

MICHAEL A. BROWN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 3300

Woodcock Washburn Kurtz Mackiewicz and Morris
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103